arXiv:1402.0032v1 [math.FA] 31 Jan 2014

# Minimal Projections with respect to Numerical Radius

Asuman Güven Aksoy and Grzegorz Lewicki

**Abstract**

In this paper we survey some results on minimality of projections with respect to numerical radius. We note that in the cases $L^p$, $p = 1, 2, \infty$, there is no difference between the minimality of projections measured either with respect to operator norm or with respect to numerical radius. However, we give an example of a projection from $l_3^p$ onto a two-dimensional subspace which is minimal with respect to norm, but not with respect to numerical radius for $p \neq 1, 2, \infty$. Furthermore, utilizing a theorem of Rudin and motivated by Fourier projections, we give a criterion for minimal projections, measured in numerical radius. Additionally, some results concerning strong unicity of minimal projections with respect to numerical radius are given.

## 1 Introduction

A projection from a normed linear space $X$ onto a subspace $V$ is a bounded linear operator $P : X \to V$ having the property that $P_{|_V} = I$. $P$ is called a *minimal projection* if $\|P\|$ is the least possible. Finding a minimal projection of the least norm has its obvious connection to approximation theory, since for any $P \in \mathcal{P}(X, V)$, the set of all projections from $X$ onto $V$, and $x \in X$, from the inequality:

$$\|x - Px\| \leq (\|Id - P\|)\, dist(x, V) \leq (1 + \|P\|)\, dist(x, V), \tag{1}$$

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification*: Primary 41A35,41A65, Secondary 47A12.
*Key words and phrases*: numerical radius, minimal projection, diagonal extremal pairs, Fourier projection.

one can deduce that $Px$ is a good approximation to $x$ if $\|P\|$ is small. Furthermore, any minimal projection $P$ is an extension of $Id_V$ to the space $X$ of the smallest possible norm, which can be interpreted as a Hahn-Banach extensions. In general, a given subspace will not be the range of a projection of norm 1, and the projection of least norm is difficult to discover even if its existence is known *a priori*. For example, the minimal projection of $C[0,1]$ onto the subspace $\Pi_3$ of polynomials of degree $\leq 3$ is unknown. For an explicit determination of the projection of minimal norm from the subspace $C[-1,1]$ onto $\Pi_2$, see [8]. However, it is known that, see [10], for a Banach space $X$ and subspace $V \subset X$, $V = Z^*$ for some Banach space $Z$, then there exists a minimal projection $P : X \to Z$. A well known example of a minimal projection, [13], is Fourier projection $F_m : C(2\pi) \to \Pi_M := \text{span}\{1, \sin x, \cos x, \ldots, \sin mx, \cos mx\}$ defined as

$$F_m(f) = \sum_{k=0}^{m} \alpha_k \cos kx + \sum_{k=0}^{m} \beta_k \sin kx \tag{2}$$

where $\alpha_k, \beta_k$ are Fourier coefficients and $C(2\pi)$ denotes $2\pi-$periodic, real-valued functions equipped with the sup norm. For uniqueness of minimality of Fourier projection also see [19]. Let $X$ be a Banach space over $\mathbb{R}$ or $\mathbb{C}$. We write $B_X(r)$ for a closed ball with radius $r > 0$ and center at 0 ($B_X$ if $r = 1$) and $S_X$ for the unit sphere of $X$. The dual space of $X$ is denoted by $X^*$ and the Banach algebra of all continuous linear operators going from $X$ into a Banach space $Y$ is denoted by $B(X,Y)$ ($B(X)$ if $X = Y$).

The numerical range of a bounded linear operator $T$ on $X$ is a subset of a scalar field, constructed in such a way that it is related to both algebraic and norm structures of the operator, more precisely:

**Definition 1.1.** *The* n*umerical range* $T \in \vec{B}(X)$ *is defined by*

$$W(T) = \{x^*(Tx) : x \in S_X, x^* \in S_{X^*}, x^*(x) = 1\}. \tag{3}$$

Notice that the condition $x^*(x) = 1$ gives us that $x^*$ is a norm attaining functional.

The concept of a numerical range comes from Toepliz's original definition of the *field of values* associated with a matrix, which is the image of the unit sphere under the quadratic form induced by the matrix $A$:

$$F(A) = \{x^*Ax : \|x\| = 1, x \in \mathbb{C}^n\}, \tag{4}$$

where $x^*$ is the original conjugate transform and $\|x\|$ is the usual Euclidean norm. It is known that the classical numerical range of a matrix always contains the spectrum, and as a result study of numerical range can help understand properties that depend on the location of the eigenvalues such as stability and non-singularity of matrices. In case $A$ is a normal matrix, then the numerical range is the polygon in the complex plane whose vertices are eigenvalues of $A$. In particular, if $A$ is hermitian, then the polygon reduces to the segment on the real axis bounded by the smallest and largest eigenvalue, which perhaps explains the name numerical range.

The *numerical radius* of $T$ is given by

$$\|T\|_w = \sup\{|\lambda| : \lambda \in W(T)\}. \tag{5}$$

Clearly $\|T||_w$ is a semi-norm on $B(X)$ and $\|T\|_w \leq \|T||$ for all $T \in B(X)$. For example, if we consider $T : \mathbb{C}^n \to \mathbb{C}^n$ as a right shift operator

$$T(f_1, f_2 \ldots, f_n) = (0, f_1, f_2, \ldots, f_{n-1})$$

then $\langle Tf, f\rangle = f_1\overline{f}_2 + f_2\overline{f}_3 + \ldots f_{n-1}\overline{f}_n$ and consequently to find $\|T\|_w$ we must find $\sup\{|f_1||f_2|+\cdots+|f_{n-1}||f_n|\}$ subject to the condition $\sum_{i=1}^{n} |f_i|^2 = 1$. The solution to this "Lagrange multiplier" problem is

$$\|T\|_w = \cos\left(\frac{\pi}{n+1}\right). \tag{6}$$

The *numerical index* of $X$ is then given by

$$n(X) = \inf\left\{\|T\|_w : T \in S_{B(X)}\right\}. \tag{7}$$

Equivalently, the numerical index $n(X)$ is the greatest constant $k \geq 0$ such that $k\|T\| \leq \|T\|_w$ for every $T \in B(X)$. Note also that $0 \leq n(X) \leq 1$ and $n(X) > 0$ if and only if $\|\cdot\|_w$ and $\|\cdot\|$ are equivalent norms. The concept of numerical index was first introduced by Lumer [14] in 1968. Since then much attention has been paid to the constant of equivalence between the numerical radius and the usual norm of the Banach algebra of all bounded linear operators of a Banach space. Two classical books devoted to these concepts are [7] and [6]. For more recent results we refer the reader to [4],[15],[16] and [11].

In this paper, we study minimality of projections with respect to numerical radius. Since operator norm of $T$ is defined as $\|T\| = \sup |\langle Tx, y\rangle|$ with $(x, y) \in B(X) \times B(X^*)$, while numerical radius $\|T\|_w = \sup |\langle Tx,\ y\rangle|$ with $(x, y) \in B(X) \times B(X^*)$ and $\langle x, y\rangle = 1$, $\|T\|$ is bilinear and $\|T\|_w$ is quadratic in nature. However, $\|T\|_w \leq \|T\|$ implies that there are more spaces for which $\|T\| \geq 1$ but $\|T\|_w = 1$.

Furthermore, if $T$ is a bounded linear operator on a Hilbert space $H$, then the numerical radius takes the form

$$\|T\|_w = \sup\{|\langle Tx, x\rangle| : \|x\| = 1\}. \tag{8}$$

This follows from the fact that for each linear functional $x^*$ there is a unique $x_0 \in H$ such that $x^*(x) = \langle x, x_0\rangle$ for all $x \in H$. Moreover, if $T$ is self-adjoint or a normal operator on a Hilbert space $H$, then

$$\|T\|_w = \|T\|. \tag{9}$$

Also, if a non-zero $T : H \to H$ is self-adjoint and compact, then $T$ has an eigenvalue $\lambda$ such that

$$\|T\|_w = \|T\| = \lambda. \tag{10}$$

These properties of numerical radius together with the desirable properties of diagonal projections from Hilbert spaces onto closed subspaces proved motivation to investigate minimal projections with respect to numerical radius.

# 2 Characterization of Minimal Numerical Radius Projections

In [1] a characterization of minimal numerical radius extension of operators from a Banach space $X$ onto its finite dimensional subspace $V = [v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_n]$ is given. To express this theorem, we first set up our notation.

**Notation 2.1.** *Let* $T = \sum_{i=1}^{n} u_i \otimes v_i : V \to V$ *where* $u_i \in V^*$ *and its extension to* $X$ *is denoted by* $\widetilde{T} : X \to V$ *and defined as*

$$\widetilde{T} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \tilde{u}_i \otimes v_i, \tag{11}$$

*where* $\widetilde{u}_i \in X^*$.

**Definition 2.2.** *Let $X$ be a Banach space. If $x \in X$ and $x^* \in X^*$ are such that*

$$|\langle x, x^* \rangle| = \|x\|\|x^*\| \neq 0, \tag{12}$$

*then $x^*$ is called an* extremal *of $x$ and written as $x^* = ext\, x$. Similarity, $x$ is an extremal of $x^*$. We call $(ext\, y, y) \in S_{X^{**}} \times S_{X^*}$ a* diagonal extremal pair *for $\widetilde{T} \in B(X, V)$ if*

$$\langle \widetilde{T}^{**} x, y \rangle = \|\widetilde{T}\|_w, \tag{13}$$

*where $\widetilde{T}^{**} : X^{**} \to V$ is the second adjoint extension of $\widetilde{T}$ are $V = [v_1, \ldots, v_n] \subset X$. In other words, the map $\widetilde{T}$ has the expression $\widetilde{T} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \tilde{u}_i \otimes v_i : X \to V$ and*

$$\widetilde{T}x = \sum_{n=1}^{n} \langle x, \tilde{u}_i \rangle v_i \tag{14}$$

*where $\tilde{u}_i \in X^*$, $v_i \in V$ and $\langle x, \tilde{u}_i \rangle$ denotes the functional $\tilde{u}_i$ is acting on $x$ and*

$$\widetilde{T}^{**} x = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \langle u_i, x \rangle v_i, \tag{15}$$

*$u_i \in X^{***}$, $v_i \in V$, $x \in X^{**}$.*

The set of all diagonal extremal pairs will be denoted by $\mathcal{E}_w(\widetilde{T})$ and defined as:

$$\mathcal{E}_w(\widetilde{T}) = \left\{ (ext\, y, y) \in S_{X^{**}} \times S_{X^*} : \ \|\widetilde{T}\|_w = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \langle ext\, y, u_i \rangle \cdot \langle v_i, y \rangle \right\}. \tag{16}$$

Note that to each $(x, y) \in X^{**} \times X^*$ we associate the rank-one operator $y \otimes x : X \to X^{**}$ given by

$$(y \otimes x)(z) = \langle z, y \rangle x \qquad \text{for } z \in X. \tag{17}$$

Accordingly, to each $(x, y) \in \mathcal{E}_w(\widetilde{T})$ we can associate the rank-one operator $y \otimes ext\, y : X \to X^{**}$ given by

$$(y \otimes ext\, y)(z) = \langle z, y \rangle ext\, y. \tag{18}$$

By $\mathcal{E}(\widetilde{T})$ we denote the usual set of all extremal pairs for $\widetilde{T}$ and

$$\mathcal{E}(\widetilde{T}) = \left\{ (x, y) \in S_{X^{**}} \times S_{X^*} : \|\widetilde{T}\| = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \langle x, u_i \rangle \cdot \langle v_i, y \rangle \right\}. \tag{19}$$

In case of diagonal extremal pairs we require $|\langle ext\, y, y\rangle| = 1$.

**Definition 2.3.** *Let* $T = \sum_{i=1}^{n} u_i \otimes v_i : V \to V = [v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_n] \subset X$, *where* $u_i \in V^*$. *Let* $\widetilde{T} : \sum i = 1^n \tilde{u}_i \otimes v_i : X \to V$ *be an extension of* $T$ *to all of* $X$. *We say* $\widetilde{T}$ *is a* minimal numerical extension *of* $T$ *if*

$$\|\widetilde{T}\| = \inf\left\{\|S\|_w : S : X \to V \ ; \ S_{|_V} = T\right\}. \tag{20}$$

*Clearly* $\|T\|_w \leq \|\widetilde{T}\|_w$.

**Theorem 2.4.** *([1])* $\widetilde{T}$ *is a minimal radius-extension of* $T$ *if an only if the closed convex hull of* $\{y \otimes x\}$ *where* $(x, y) \in \mathcal{E}_w(\widetilde{T})$ *contains an operator for which* $V$ *is an invariant subspace.*

**Theorem 2.5.** $P$ *is a minimal projection from* $X$ *onto* $V$ *if and only if the closed convex hull of* $\{y \otimes x\}$, *where* $(x, y) \in \mathcal{E}_w(P)$ *contains an operator for which* $V$ *is an invariant subspace.*

*Proof.* By taking $T = I$ and $\widetilde{T} = P$ one can appropriately modify the proof given in [1] without much difficulty. The problem is equivalent to the best approximation in the numerical radius of a fixed operator from the space of operator

$$\mathcal{D} = \{\Delta \in \mathcal{B} : \Delta = 0 \text{ on } V\} = sp\{\delta \otimes v : \delta \in V^{\perp}; v \in V\}.$$

One of the main ingredients of the proof is Singer's identification theorem ([20], Theorem 1.1 (p.18) and Theorem 1.3 (p.29)) of finding the minimal operator as the error of best approximation in C(K) for $K$ Compact. In the case of numerical radius, one considers $K_w = K \cap Diag = \{(x, y) \in B(X^{**}) \times B(X^*) : x = ext(y) \text{ or } x = 0\}$ and shows $K_w$ is compact. Thus the set $\mathcal{E}(P)$, being the set of points where a continuous (bilinear) function achieves its maximum on a compact set, is not empty. For further details see [1]. □

**Theorem 2.6.** *(When minimal projections coincide) In case* $X = L^p$ *for* $p = 1, 2, \infty$, *the minimal numerical radius projections and the minimal operator norm projections coincide with the same norms.*

*Proof.* In case of $L^2$, for any self-adjoint operator, we have

$$\|P\| = \|P\|_w = |\lambda|, \tag{21}$$

where $\lambda$ is the maximum (in modulus) eigenvalue. In this case,

$$\|P\| = \|P\|_w = |\langle Px, x\rangle|, \tag{22}$$

where $x$ is a norm-1 "maximum" eigenvector.

When $p = 1, \infty$, it is well known that $n(L^p) = 1$ ([7], section 9) thus

$$\|P\| = \|P\|_w. \tag{23}$$

□

**Example 2.7.** *The projection $P : l_3^p \to [v_1, v_2] = V$ where $v_1 = (1, 1, 1)$ and $v_2 = (-1, 0, 1)$ is minimal with respect to the operator norm, but not minimal with respect to numerical radius for $1 < p < \infty$ and $p \neq 2$. Let us denote by $P_o, P_m$ projections minimal with respect to operator norm and numerical radius respectively. In other words*

$$\begin{aligned} \|P_o\| &= \inf\{\|P\| : P \in \mathcal{P}(X, V)\} \\ \|P_m\|_w &= \inf\{\|P\|_w : P \in \mathcal{P}(X, V)\}. \end{aligned}$$

*Note that*

$$P_o(f) = u_1(f)v_1 + u_2(f)v_2 \quad \textit{and} \quad P_m(f) = z_1(f)v_1 + z_2(f)v_2. \tag{24}$$

*Then it is easy to see that*

$$\begin{aligned} u_1 = z_1 &= \left(-\frac{1}{2}, 0, \frac{1}{2}\right) \\ u_2 &= \left(\frac{1-d}{2}, d, \frac{1-d}{2}\right) \\ z_2 &= \left(\frac{1-g}{2}, g, \frac{1-g}{2}\right), \end{aligned}$$

*and for $p = \dfrac{4}{3}$ it is possible to determine $g$ and $d$ to conclude $\|P_o\| = 1.05251$ while $\|P_m\|_w = 1.02751$, thus $\|P_o\| \neq \|P_m\|_w$.*

V. P. Odinec in [18] (see also [17], [12]) proves that minimal projections of norm greater than one from a three-dimensional Banach space onto any of its two-dimensional subspaces are unique. Thus in the above example, the projection from $l_3^p$ onto a two-dimensional subspace not only proves the fact that $\|P_o\| \neq \|P_m\|_w$ for $p \neq 1, 2, \infty$, here once again we have the uniqueness of the projections.

# 3 Rudin's Projection and Numerical Radius

One of the key thoerems on minimal projections is due to W. Rudin ([21] and [22]) The setting for his theorem is as follows. $X$ is a Banach space and $G$ is a compact topological group. Defined on $X$ is a set $\mathcal{A}$ of all bounded linear bijective operators in a way that $\mathcal{A}$ is algebraically isomorphic to $G$. The image of $g \in G$ under this isomorphism will be denoted by $T_g$. We will assume that the map $G \times X \to X$ defined as $(g, x) \mapsto T_g x$ is continuous. A subspace $V$ of $X$ is called *G-invariant* if $T_g(V) \subset V$ for all $g \in G$ and a mapping $S : X \to X$ is said to *commute* with $G$ if $S \circ T_g = T_g \circ S$ for all $g \in G$. In case $\|T_g\| = 1$ for all $g \in G$, we say $g$ acts on $G$ by *isometries*.

**Theorem 3.1.** *([22]) Let $G$ be a compact topological group acting by isomorphism on a Banach space $X$ and let $V$ be a complemented $G$–invariant subspace of $X$. If there exists a bound projection $P$ of $X$ onto $V$, then there exists a bounded linear projection $Q$ of $X$ onto $V$ which commutes with $G$.*

The idea behind the proof of the above theorem is to obtain $Q$ by averaging the operators $T_{g^{-1}} P T_g$ with respect to Haar measure $\mu$ on $G$. i.e.,

$$Q(x) := \int_G \left(T_{g^{-1}} P T_g\right)(x)\, d\mu(g). \tag{25}$$

Now assume $X$ has a norm which contains the maps $\mathcal{A}$ to be *isometries* and all of the hypotheses in Rudin's theorem are satisfied, then one can claim the following stronger version of Rudin's theorem :

**Corollary 3.2.** *If there is a* unique *projection $Q : X \to V$ which commutes with $G$, then for any $P \in \mathcal{P}(X, V)$, the projection*

$$Q(x) = \int_G \left(T_{g^{-1}} P T_g\right)(x)\, d\mu(g), \tag{26}$$

*is a* minimal projection *of $X$ onto $V$.*

**Theorem 3.3.** *([3]) Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a set of all bounded linear bijective operators on $X$ such that $\mathcal{A}$ is algebraically isomorphic to $G$. Suppose that all of the hypotheses of Rudin's theorem above are satisfied and the maps in $\mathcal{A}$ are isometries. If $P$ is any projection in the numerical radius of $X$ onto $V$, then the projection $Q$ defined as*

$$Q(x) = \int_G \left(T_{g^{-1}} P T_g\right)(x)\, d\mu(g) \tag{27}$$

*satisfies $\|Q\|_w \leq \|P\|_w$.*

*Proof.* Consider $\|Q\|_w = \sup\{|x^*(Qx)| : x^*(Qx) \in W(Q)\}$, where $W(Q)$ is the numerical range of $Q$. Notice that

$$\begin{aligned} |x^*(Qx)| &= \left| x^* \int_G \left(T_{g^{-1}} P T_g\right)(x)\, d\mu(g) \right| \\ &\leq \int_G \left| \left(x^* \circ T_{g^{-1}}\right) P(T_g x) \right| \, d\mu(g). \end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

But $\|x\| = 1$ and $\|x^*\| = 1$ which implies that $\|T_g x\| = 1$ and $\|x^* T_{g^{-1}}\| = 1$, moreover,

$$1 = x^*(x) = x^* T_{g^{-1}}(T_g x) \implies |x^*(Qx)| \leq \|P\|_w. \tag{29}$$

Consequently, $\|Q\|_w \leq \|P\|_w$ which proves $Q$ is a minimal projection in numerical radius. □

**Theorem 3.4.** *([3]) Suppose all hypotheses of the above theorem are satisfied and that there is exactly one projection $Q$ which commutes with $G$. Then $Q$ is a minimal projection with respect to numerical radius.*

*Proof.* Let $P \in \mathcal{P}(X, V)$. By the properties of Haar measure, $Q_p$ given in the above theorem commutes with $G$. Since there is exactly one projection which commutes with $G$, $Q_p = Q$ and $\|Q\|_w \leq \|P\|_w$ as desired. □

**Remark 3.5.** *In [3] it is shown that if $G$ is a compact topological group acting by isometries on a Banach space $X$ and if we let*

$$\psi : B(X) \to [0, +\infty], \tag{30}$$

*be a convex function which is lower semi-continuous in the strong operator topology and if one further assumes that*

$$\psi\left(g^{-1} \circ P \circ g\right) \leq \psi(P), \tag{31}$$

*for some $P \in B(X)$ and $g \in G$, then $\psi(Q_P) \leq \psi(P)$. This result leads to calculation of minimal projections not only with respect to numerical radius but also with respect to p-summing, p-nuclear and p-integral norms. For details see [3].*

# 4 An Application

Let $C(2\pi)$ denote the set of all continuous $2\pi$-periodic functions and $\Pi_n$ be the space of all trigonometric polynomials of order $\leq n$ (for $n \geq 1$).

The *Fourier projection* $F_n : C(2\pi) \to \Pi_n$ is defined by

$$F_n(f) = \sum_{k=0}^{2n} \left( \int_0^{2\pi} f(t) g_n(t) dt \right) g_k, \tag{32}$$

where $(g_k)_{k=0}^{2n}$ is an orthonormal basis in $\Pi_n$ with respect to the scalar product

$$\langle f, g \rangle = \int_0^{2\pi} f(t) g(t) dt. \tag{33}$$

Lozinskii in [13] showed that $F_n$ is a minimal projection in $\mathcal{P}(C(2\pi), \Pi_n)$. His proof is based on the equality which states that for any $f \in C(2\pi)$, $t \in [0, 2\pi]$ and $P \in \mathcal{P}(C(2\pi), \Pi_n)$, we have

$$F_n f(t) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \left( T_{g^{-1}} P T_g f \right)(t) \, d\mu(g). \tag{34}$$

Here $\mu$ is a Lebesgue measure and $(T_g f)(t) = f(t + g)$ for any $g \in \mathbb{R}$. This equality is called Marcinkiewicz equality ([9] p.233).

Notice that $F_n$ is the only projection that commutes with $G$, where $G = [0, 2\pi]$ with addition mod $2\pi$. In particular, $F_n$ is a minimal projection with respect to numerical radius.

Since we know the upper and lower bounds on the operator norm of $F_n$, more precisely ([9] p.212)

$$\frac{4}{\pi^2} ln(n) \leq \|F_n\| \leq ln(n) + 3. \tag{35}$$

From the theorem (when minimal projections coincide) we know that in cases of $L^p$, $p = 1, \infty$, the numerical radius projections and the operator norm

projections are equal. Since $C(2\pi) \in L^\infty$, we also have lower and upper bounds for the numerical radius of Fourier projections, i.e.,

$$\frac{4}{\pi^2} ln(n) \leq \|F_n\|_w \leq ln(n) + 3. \tag{36}$$

**Remark 4.1.** *Lozinskii's proof of the minimality of $F_n$ is based on Marcinkiewicz equality. However, the Marcinkiewicz equality holds true if one replaces $C(2\pi)$ by $L^p[0, 2\pi]$ for $1 \leq p \leq \infty$ or Orlicz space $L^\phi[0, 2\pi]$ equipped with Luxemburg or Orlicz norm provided $\phi$ satisfies the suitable $\Delta_2$ condition. Hence, Theorem 3.3 can be applied equally well to numerical radius or norm in Banach operator ideals of p-summing, p-integral,p-nuclear operators generated by $L^p$-norm or the Luxemburg or Orlicz norm. For further examples see [3].*

# 5 Strongly Unique Minimal Extensions

In [18] (see also [17]) it is shown that a minimal projection of the operator norm greater than one from a three dimensional real Banach space onto any of its two dimensional subspace is the unique minimal projection with respect to the operator norm. Later in [12] this result is generalized as follows:
Let $X$ is a three dimensional real Banach space and $V$ be its two dimensional subspace. Suppose $A \in B(V)$ is a fixed operator. Set

$$\mathcal{P}_A(X, V) = \{P \in B(X, V) : \ P \mid_V = A \}$$

and assume $\| P_0 \| > \| A \|$, if $P_o \in \mathcal{P}_A(X, V)$ is an extension of minimal operator norm. Then $P_o$ is *a strongly unique minimal extension with respect to operator norm.*
In other words there exists $r > 0$ such that for all $P \in \mathcal{P}_A(X, V)$ one has

$$\|P\| \geq \|P_o\| + r \|P - P_o\|.$$

**Definition 5.1.** *We say an operator $A_o \in \mathcal{P}_A(X, V)$ is a strongly unique minimal extension with respect to numerical radius if there exists $r > 0$ such that*

$$\|B\|_w \geq \|A_o\|_w + r \|B - A_o\|_w$$

*for any $B \in \mathcal{P}_A(X, V)$.*

A natural extension of the above mentioned results to the case of numerical radius $\|\cdot\|_w$ was given in [2].

**Theorem 5.2.** *([2]) Assume that $X$ is a three dimensional real Banach space and let $V$ be its two dimensional subspace. Fix $A \in B(V)$ with $\|A\|_w > 0$. Let*

$$\lambda_w^A = \lambda_w^A(V, X) = \inf\{\|B\|_w : B \in \mathcal{P}_A(X, V)\} > \|A\|,$$

*where $\|A\|$ denotes the operator norm. Then there exist exactly one $A_o \in \mathcal{P}_A(X, V)$ such that*

$$\lambda_w^A = \|A_o\|_w.$$

*Moreover, $A_o$ is the strongly minimal extension with respect to numerical radius.*

Notice that if we take $A = id_V$ then $\|A\|_w = \|A\| = 1$. In this case Theorem (5.2) reduces to the following theorem:

**Theorem 5.3.** *([2]) Assume that $X$ is a three dimensional real Banach space and let $V$ be its two dimensional subspace. Assume that*

$$\lambda_w^{id_V} > 1.$$

*Then there exist exactly one $P_o \in \mathcal{P}(X, V)$ of minimal numerical radius. Moreover , $P_o$ is a strongly unique minimal projection with respect to numerical radius. In particular $P_o$ is the only one minimal projection with respect to the numerical radius.*

**Remark 5.4.** *([2]) Notice that in Theorem (5.2) the assumption that $\|A\| < \lambda_w^A$ is essential. Indeed, let $X = l_\infty^{(3)}$, $V = \{x \in X : x_1 + x_2 = 0\}$ and $A = id_V$. Define*

$$P_1 x = x - (x_1 + x_2)(1, 0, 0)$$

*and*

$$P_2 x = x - (x_1 + x_2)(0, 1, 0).$$

*It is clear that*

$$\|P_1\| = \|P_1\|_w = \|P_2\| = \|P_2\|_w = 1$$

*and $P_1 \neq P_2$. Hence, there is no strongly unique minimal projection with respect to numerical radius in this case.*

**Remark 5.5.** *([2]) Theorem (5.3) cannot be generalized for real spaces $X$ of dimension $n \geq 4$. Indeed let $X = l_\infty^{(n)}$, and let $V = ker(f)$, where $f = (0, f_2, ..., f_n) \in l_1^{(n)}$ satisfies $f_i > 0$ for $i = 2, ..., n$, $\sum_{i=2}^n f_i = 1$ and $f_i < 1/2$ for $i = 1, ..., n$. It is known (see e.g. [5], [17]) that in this case*

$$\lambda(V, X) = 1 + (\sum_{i=2}^{n} f_i/(1 - 2f_i))^{-1} > 1,$$

*where*

$$\lambda(V, X) = \inf\{\|P\| : P \in (X, V)\}.$$

*By [1], $\lambda(V, X) = \lambda_w^{id_V}$. Define for $i = 1, ..., n$ $y_i = (\lambda(V, X) - 1)(1 - 2f_i)$. Let $y = (y_1, ..., y_n)$ and $z = (0, y_2, ..., y_n)$. Consider mappings $P_1, P_2$ defined by*

$$P_1 x = x - f(x)y$$

*and*

$$P_2 x = x - f(x)z$$

*for $x \in l_\infty^{(n)}$. It is easy to see that $P_i \in \mathcal{P}(X, V)$, for $i = 1, 2$, $P_1 \neq P_2$. By ([17] p. 104) $\|P_i\| = \|P_i\|_w = \lambda(V, X) = \lambda_w^{id_V}$. for $i = 1, 2$.*

**Remark 5.6.** *Theorem(5.3) is not valid for complex three dimensional spaces. For details see [2].*

For Kolmogorov type criteria concerning approximation with respect to numerical radius, we refer the reader to [2].

# References


[1] A. G. Aksoy and B. L. Chalmers, *Minimal numerical radius extensions of operators*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **135** (2007), 1039–1050.

[2] A. G. Aksoy and G. Lewicki, *Best approximation in numerical radius*, Numer. Funct. Anal. Optim. **32** (2011), 593–609.

[3] A. G. Aksoy and G. Lewicki, *Minimal projections with respect to various norms*, Studia Math. **210** (2012), 1–16.

[4] A. G. Aksoy and G. Lewicki, *Limit theorems for the numerical index*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **398** (2013), 296–302.

[5] J. Blatter and E. W. Cheney, *Minimal projections onto hyperplanes in sequence spaces,* Ann. Mat. Pura Appl., Vol. 101, (1974), 215 -227.

[6] F. F. Bonsall and J. Duncan, *Numerical ranges II*, London Math. Soc Lecture Nq ote Ser. 10, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1971.

[7] F. F. Bonsall and J. Duncan, *Numerical ranges of operators on normed spaces and of elements of normed algebras*, London Math Soc. Lecture Note Ser. 2, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1971.

[8] B. L. Chalmers and F.T. Metcalf, *Determination of minimal projection from* $C[-1,1]$ *onto the quadratics*, Numer. Funt. Anal. Optim. **11** (1990), 1–10.

[9] E. W. Cheney, *Introduction to approximation theory*, McGraw-Hill, 1966.

[10] E. W. Cheney and P. D. Morris, *On the existence and characterization of minimal projections*, J. Reine Angew. Math **279** (1974), 61–76.

[11] K. E. Gustafson and D. K. M. Rao, *Numerical range: The field of values of linear operators and matrices*, Springer, 1997.

[12] G. Lewicki, *Strong unicity criterion in some spaces of operators,* Comment. Math. Univ. Carolinae, Vol. 34,1, (1993), 81 -87.

[13] S. M. Lozinskii, *On a class of linear operators*, Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR **61** (1948), 193–196.

[14] G.Lumer, *Semi-inner-product spaces*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **100** (1961), 29–43.

[15] M. Martin, *A survey on the numerical index of Banach space*, Extracta Math. **15** (200), 265–276.

[16] M. Martin, J. Meri, and M. Popov, *On the numerical index of* $L^p(\mu)$*-spaces*, Israel J. Math. **184** (2011), 183–192.

[17] W. Odyniec, G. Lewicki *Minimal Projections in Banach spaces*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, 1449, Springer-Verlag, 1990.

[18] V. P. Odinec, *The uniqueness of minimal projections in Banach spaces*, Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR **220** (1975), 779–781. .

[19] P. D. Morris S. D. Fisher and D. E. Wulbert, *Unique minimal of Fourier projections*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **265** (1981), 235–246.

[20] I. Singer, *Best approximation in normed linear spaces by elements of linear subspaces*, Springer, 1970.

[21] W. Rudin, *Functional analysis*, McGraw-Hill, 1974

[22] W. Rudin, *Projections onto invariant subspaces*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **13** (1962), 429–432.

Asuman Güven Aksoy
Department of Mathematics
Claremont McKenna College
Claremont, CA, 91711, USA
e-mail: aaksoy@cmc.edu

Grzegorz Lewicki
Dept. of Math and Comp. Sci.
Jagiellonian University
Lojasiewicza 6
30-348 Kraków, Poland
e-mail:Grzegorz.Lewicki@im.uj.edu.pl